

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2020

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4616	
GEF Agency project ID		614715	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		Climate Change Adaptation to Reduce Land Degradation in Fragile Micro-Watersheds located in the Municipalities of Texistepeque and Candelaria de la Frontera	
Country/Countries		El Salvador	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Multifocal (Land Degradation, Climate Change)	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		LD-1, LD-3; CCA-1, CCA-2	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		4/17/2014	
Effectiveness date / project start		11/1/2014	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		11/1/2017	
Actual date of project completion		6/3/2018	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.05	0.05
	Co-financing	0.13	0.13
GEF Project Grant		1.52	1.52
Co-financing	IA own	0.10	0.00
	Government	6.34	9.56
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		0.02
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		1.57	1.57
Total Co-financing		6.57	9.58
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		8.14	11.28
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		August 2018	
Author of TE		Roger Miranda and Mauricio Quesada	
TER completion date		6/10/2019	
TER prepared by		Cody Parker	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S		MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		MU		MU
M&E Design		MS		MS
M&E Implementation		MU		MS
Quality of Implementation		HS		S
Quality of Execution		MS		UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report				S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environmental Objective is to "contribute to arresting and reversing current global trends in land degradation, in particular desertification and deforestation, through the promotion of sustainable land and water management practices in areas with highly degraded natural resources and vulnerable to desertification in the Santa Ana Department" (PD, 3).

In addition, the project document presents an Adaptation Objective: "to reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change and variability, and to increase adaptive capacity to respond to these impacts, with the participation of small-scale rural producers – linked to the Family Agricultural Plan (FAP) – in targeted micro-watersheds in the Santa Ana Department" (PD, 3).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's Development Objective is to "increase and improve the provision of goods and services from agriculture and forestry in a sustainable manner, through the promotion of integrated natural resources management and the reduction of land degradation; and to increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises by mainstreaming climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction into Fragile Micro-Watersheds Management Plans, with the participation of small-scale farmers" (PD, 3).

The objectives were to be achieved through four project components:

Component 1: Institutional strengthening in design and implementation of Fragile Micro-Watershed Management Plans that increase adaptive capacities to the adverse impacts of climate change, based on a participatory and gender-sensitive approach;

Component 2: Soil quality enhancement based on the increase of vegetation cover, integrated natural resource management, suitable land-use, and recovering the flow of agro-ecosystem services in fragile micro-watersheds, with a gender-sensitive approach;

Component 3: Increasing water quality and quantity to diversify livelihoods and income sources of vulnerable sectors in targeted micro-watersheds, enhancing participatory and gender-sensitive management; and

Component 4: Improving disaster risk management to increase adaptive capacity to climate change, in vulnerable sectors living in targeted micro-watersheds.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes to the Objectives. However, there was a reduction in the number of micro-watersheds covered by the project from 6 to 4. Due to insufficient support from the local municipal authorities, activities planned in Texistepeque were transferred to the municipality of Metapan, which is also in Santa Ana Department and has similar conditions, but only 1 watershed instead of 3 as in Texistepeque (PIR 2016, 5).

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------	----------------------

The TE rates relevance as Highly Satisfactory. This TER rates relevance as Satisfactory.

The project was highly relevant to El Salvador's national priorities and strategies, in particular: the 2010-2014 Five Year Development Plan, which includes the strategic objectives of reversing environmental degradation and strengthening environmental risk management; the National Environmental Policy of 2012; and the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock's "Environmental Strategy for Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation in Agriculture, Livestock, Forestry and Aquaculture Sectors" (TE, 22). The project was in line with GEF's Land Degradation objectives 1 and 3, especially through its focus on activities promoting the sustainable use of soil to recuperate the flow of agroecosystems services. The project was also relevant to FAO's Strategic Objectives 2 and 5 (increasing/improving goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries; increasing livelihood resilience to threats and crises).

While no theory of change was explicitly outlined in project design, the project's activities were well-designed to achieve its objectives by addressing the policy framework while strengthening household- and community-level awareness and capacity for resource management and climate change adaptation. A highly participative process both in project design and implementation ensured that the project remained relevant to the needs of individual and community beneficiaries. Relevance is therefore rated Satisfactory.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates effectiveness as Satisfactory. This TER revises the rating to Moderately Satisfactory. Most project outcomes were achieved. As a result, the management of land and water resources has improved and the level of awareness and capacity for climate change adaptation has increased. However, there was unsatisfactory progress in improving beneficiaries' actual level of food security and in reducing vulnerability to climate change.

Component 1: Institutional strengthening in design and implementation of Fragile Micro-Watershed Management Plan to improve CC adaptation capacities. The project coordinated, and enhanced the capacities of, seven local government bodies to integrate CC adaptation into the planning and management of four fragile micro-watersheds. Teaching workshops were conducted, through which 110 specialists (exceeding the target of 90) received training on various topics including food security, climate change, sustainable management of soil and water, and risk management. This training was viewed favorably by the specialists, and made it possible for the government institutions to help provide solutions for families living in the micro-watershed areas (TE, 28-29). The target of "75% of men, women, local authorities and institutions in the selected areas aware of the adverse impacts of climate change and the appropriate responses" was met, with 100% of institutional representatives and leaders reporting awareness while 77% of the population in the project area are aware of the adverse impacts of CC and of appropriate response measures (TE, 52). 83% of families surveyed stated that the first time they heard of CC was through the project, suggesting a significant impact on awareness. Families are now taking associated actions on their own initiative, such as planting fruit and forest trees and applying improved agricultural practices (TE, 30). Of the six targeted Fragile Micro-Watershed Management Plans, four were completed (one for each micro-watershed ultimately targeted), but this was achieved only at the end of the project, limiting the possibility of continued support and follow-up. Nonetheless, the beneficiaries showed ownership of the Plans and capacity to implement them (TE, 33). Training on climate change impacts and identification of weaknesses was successfully delivered to 773 beneficiaries, with 100% reporting having put the knowledge gained into practice. On the other hand, despite a 15% increase in food production and 1,249 households reporting having more resilient production systems (exceeding target) in project areas, food security indicators worsened significantly between the midterm and final evaluations. However, no control group was used and external factors may be responsible (TE, 37).

Component 2: Soil quality enhancement from increased vegetation cover, integrated natural resource management, suitable land use, and recovered flow of agro-ecosystem services. The target for land worked on (through planting of trees and improved grass provided by the project) for expanded vegetation cover was exceeded. Tree-planting activities involved various local stakeholders, and generated significant enthusiasm as well as expanding awareness of CC (TE, 43). However, there is no monitoring in place to measure the extent of vegetation cover increase, which would have been useful considering the reported losses of 18-29% of trees planted. The target for area under integrated natural resources management was also surpassed, as were the targets for increased agricultural production. Six Farmer Field Schools aimed at improving skills for soil conservation and protection, reaching 190 heads of household (2 below target); 100% of attendees found them very useful. Seven "Good

Agricultural Practices” (e.g. drip irrigation, organic fertilizers) were disseminated by 133 demonstrator families as planned.

Component 3: Increasing water quality/quantity to diversify livelihoods and income sources of vulnerable sectors. Ten water sources were protected through a management plan as targeted, directly benefiting 671 families. 470 families were trained and 451 actively participated in shared decision-making, construction, management and maintenance of rainwater harvesting systems, exceeding the target; 100% of heads of household participating reported the training to be useful. Five community water collection and distribution systems for domestic and productive use were constructed, benefiting 535 families. In terms of increased access to livelihoods, the TE reports that 59% of families surveyed stated that they have greater ability to conserve and manage natural resources, 29% stated that they have greater ability to tackle droughts using water reserves or through replenishment of aquifers, and 26% reported greater ability to capture, conserve and store rainwater. However, it is not clear how these results are directly related to livelihoods. Of 13 elements used to measure access to livelihoods, heads of household selected 3.58 on average, indicating only moderate access, although there was a slight improvement between the midterm and final evaluations (TE, 50). While the project certainly had a positive influence on water management, its connection to livelihood improvement was not adequately measured and is therefore uncertain.

Component 4: Improving disaster risk management to increase adaptive capacity to climate change. Four of the planned six climate risk maps were developed, in keeping with the reduction of the project area from 6 micro-watersheds to 4. An early warning system for drought was developed. The target of two action plans for weather-related emergency response was exceeded by the development of the four Management Plans under component 1. The target of “6 municipal and departmental response mechanisms to extreme weather events integrating 70-90% of the population” in the project area shows unclear progress; while the TE states that “actions have been coordinated” with the government to contribute to such mechanisms, none are reported as being completed or adopted (TE, 55). Progress on the target of 50% of rural families participating in disaster risk reduction workshops was exceeded with 75% of beneficiary families participating, suggesting that awareness has been increased. However, the population’s vulnerability index (which considers nutrition, food production, and housing status) worsened by 14% between the midterm and final evaluations (TE, 53). Overall, awareness of disaster risk management has improved, but this has not translated into concrete results as the vulnerability of the population has not been significantly reduced, and municipal/departmental disaster response mechanisms still need to be consolidated.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates efficiency as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER also rates efficiency as Moderately Satisfactory.

The project achieved its objectives mostly satisfactorily within budget and with an extension of less than one year. The Project Administration Coordination Unit, responsible for coordination and implementation of the project through its work plans, was reportedly effective and flexible, which

improved efficiency and enabled logistical adjustments to be made in a timely manner, improving efficiency. (TE, 58).

Two main factors are identified by the TE as hindering the efficiency of project implementation. The complexity and inflexibility of FAO procedures, along with the high workload of the FAO unit responsible for procurement, led to delayed approvals which negatively affected the project, for example in the slow delivery of seeds which caused the loss of a harvest cycle/sowing period (TE, 59). The considerable time and administrative effort required for procurement should have been considered in project design. Also, a change in the leadership of CENTA (National Centre of Agriculture, Livestock and Forestry Technology, a government body under the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock involved in activities under components 1 and 2) led to a nearly one-year delay in the signing of an agreement with the project. This caused delays in the execution of component 2 and consequently the project as a whole (TE, 58). Due to the overall high efficiency of the project despite these issues, efficiency is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
--------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates overall sustainability as Moderately Unlikely. This TER also rates sustainability as Moderately Unlikely, mostly due to absence of arrangements to ensure coordination and support to local communities to build on the knowledge generated by the project.

Institutional: FAO's role as an apolitical intermediary between the municipalities and central government was essential. In the absence of an "impartial" intermediary, it is unlikely that coordination will remain strong, especially in a context of partisan politics (TE, 70). Similarly, the interinstitutional coordination achieved by the project was not consolidated: at the time of TE there was no indication of a sustainable post-project coordination mechanism between institutions and communities, threatening the continuation of project activities (TE, 68).

Financial: Despite municipalities having the technical capacity and legal authority to develop "plans and programs geared towards the preservation, restoration, reasonable use and improvement of natural resources", they have no budget to continue to do so; as a result, their actions regarding disaster management will likely continue to be reactive in nature.

Sociopolitical: The vast majority of beneficiary families and community leaders are reportedly committed to continuing to implement actions combating land degradation and to improve the sustainable production of agricultural goods, and overwhelmingly positive survey responses indicate that the trainings in integrated natural resource management and disaster risk management successfully developed beneficiaries' capacities in this regard. Through activities requiring collaboration between various stakeholders, the project also improved the level of social cohesion in communities. However, without institutional financial support, communities lack the resources to continue to implement sustainable land management and adaptation activities (TE, 70). Finally, El Salvador overall is facing a situation of insecurity especially regarding gang violence; while the project area has been at the margins of conflict so far, this factor cannot be overlooked and could further jeopardize project benefits if the violence spreads (TE, 71).

Environmental: No environmental factors are identified as posing a risk to the sustainability of project outcomes.

Overall, the training, knowledge and interinstitutional dialogue generated by the project were valuable but only as a starting point. For the project's benefits to be sustained, continued support to communities from the national and local government will be necessary. In absence of plans to guide coordination among these parties, there are risks to sustainability. Therefore, likelihood of sustainability is rated as Moderately Unlikely.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Materialized co-financing totaled \$9.6 million, which is 40% higher than the amount expected at project start. Most of the increase comes from the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock in the form of "family packages" provided across the whole Santa Ana department (not only the project area); the TE does not explain the nature of these "packages" (TE, 62). The higher-than-expected overall co-financing does not seem to have impacted project activities.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project, originally scheduled for three years, was extended by 8 months to June 2018. Delays influencing the extension are attributed to a nearly one-year delay on the part of a project partner to sign an agreement, which in turn delayed the activities planned to be executed by them, as well as the need to transfer activities from Texistepeque to Metapan when authorities in the former proved uncooperative. Delays in procurement of certain unspecified "supplies and services" are also identified (TE, 9). These delays are not noted as negatively impacting the project beyond necessitating the extension.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Country ownership seems to have been satisfactory overall, one indication being the involvement of specialists from various government bodies participating in trainings and reporting them as useful. The project start was delayed by a lack of cooperation from authorities in Texistepeque, making it necessary to relocate activities to Metapan, but no other specific impacts on project outcomes or sustainability are attributed to the level of country or local ownership. Some delays were caused by changing leadership in one of the government partners (CENTA, under MAG) but this was an external issue and not due to a lack of attention/priority to the project.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates M&E design as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER also rates M&E design as Moderately Satisfactory.

The project document lays out an M&E plan including a detailed schedule for the production of various monitoring reports and independent evaluations (MTR and TE), as well as technical and co-financing reports. Institutional responsibilities for monitoring are clearly defined. The project's logical framework includes targets by project year along with assumptions and means of verification, and is overall coherent with the project logic. Indicators are well-framed to assess the achievement of objectives, and are overall SMART, although a few are ambiguous (e.g. “number of families *actively involved* in the protection of local water sources”). In addition, the means of verification for the targeted decrease in vulnerability/risk perception index are inadequate, as they rely on a survey which did not include a control group; as a result, the change in this index cannot be conclusively attributed to project activities. Considering the overall completeness and coherence of the M&E plan despite these deficiencies in indicators and verification methods, M&E design is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates M&E implementation as Moderately Unsatisfactory. This TER revises the rating to Moderately Satisfactory due to the overall satisfactory level of data collection which facilitated adaptive management and evaluation.

The TE states that the M&E strategy was “not implemented as planned”, mainly due to the monitoring systems of national institutions not being “sufficiently aligned” to provide all the data required by the M&E plan, a situation exacerbated by the remoteness of the project area which meant there was no sustained presence from national institutions (TE, 60). However, no specific examples of inadequacies in information-gathering are cited to support this conclusion, and it is noted that a significant amount of data was compiled on supplies, activities, outputs and outcomes including information about beneficiaries disaggregated by sex (as planned in the project document.) From the PIRs, tracking of results appears to be adequate and detailed, although some reported results do not match their indicator (for example, a target for improvement of vulnerability/risk perception index is reported satisfactorily achieved from “60% of population covered by climate risk mitigation measures”, without reference to the index.) Despite this issue, it is clear that substantial data was collected in line with the

M&E plan, and the TE identifies the “excellent” systemization of data at project end as valuable in identifying lessons learned (TE, 61). Therefore, M&E implementation is rated Moderately Satisfactory.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	----------------------

The TE rates quality of project implementation as Highly Satisfactory. This TER rates implementation as Satisfactory, due to the overall strong support provided by FAO despite overestimation of executing agency capacity in project design.

The project’s implementing agency was FAO. Project design was overall sound. It focused appropriately on micro-watersheds as the optimal level of intervention, and included specific actions for sustainable land and water management while addressing awareness-raising of climate change and risk management to improve the long-term capacities of beneficiaries. Risks were identified and mitigation measures well defined. On the other hand, project design overestimated the capacities of the local authorities as executors, which made it necessary to hire additional staff to fill gaps during implementation (the specific areas in which local capacity was lacking are not detailed). In addition, the project’s timeframe was overly optimistic and left no room for unexpected situations, such as the change of municipality from Texistepeque to Metapan (TE, 26).

In terms of support during implementation, the TE does not provide information beyond noting that, according to partners and beneficiaries, the technical support provided by FAO was “excellent and decisive in achieving objectives” (TE, 76). Timely adaptive management was displayed, for example through the aforementioned change of project area when authorities in Texistepeque were unable to collaborate effectively. Considering this along with the minor deficiencies in project design, quality of project implementation is rated as Satisfactory.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unable to Assess
---	--------------------------

The TE rates quality of project execution as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER is Unable to Assess the quality of project execution due to a lack of information.

The project’s executing agency was the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG). The performance of MAG is not addressed in the TE beyond the general lack of capacity mentioned above. Without more substantial information, this TER is Unable to Assess the quality of project execution.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The level of vegetation cover in the project area has increased due to project activities, and more land and water areas are under the protection of integrated natural resource management plans. However, no specific impacts of these achievements on environmental stress or status are reported in the TE.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

Despite the efforts made by the project to improve food consumption and an overall increase in food production, food security indicators suggested a worse situation at the end of the project than in the middle. For example, 83% of respondents said that they were worried about their household running out of food, compared to 70% at the midterm review; 81% said their household had run out of healthy food at least once in the past 3 months, compared to only 49% at midterm (TE, 36). However, no control group was used, and the deterioration may be influenced by other factors outside project control such as changes in agricultural goods prices. On the other hand, 99% of beneficiaries that participated in the planting of home fruit tree orchards reported that their household's diet was more diversified as a result.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

Through the trainings, workshops, and plan development guidelines generated by the project, the capacity of local communities to sustainably manage land and water resources has been improved. The efficacy of the awareness-raising and capacity building activities is confirmed through surveys of beneficiaries as well as actions taken of their own initiative such as a commercial vegetable-growing collective and organic agricultural supply plant (TE, 47). In addition, vulnerability maps and an early-warning system for emergencies were developed. Technical capacities have also been strengthened at the institutional level, with the training in geographical information systems being highlighted by participants as especially useful (TE, 67).

b) Governance

In addition to developing four Fragile Micro-Watersheds Management Plans, the project also created a Methodological Guide for the preparation of such plans, which has already been adopted by government agencies for use in other regions of the country (TE, 67). It is noted that the project resulted in increased inter-institutional collaboration where previously there had been almost none, although this progress is jeopardized by the lack of a long-term provision to maintain close coordination (TE, 68).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts are noted.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

One of the main instruments the Project created was the Methodological Guide for the preparation of Fragile Micro-Watersheds Management Plans, which has now been officially adopted by the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock and the General Directorate of Forestry, River Basins and Irrigation Management, which intend to use it in future planning and management processes of the micro-watersheds; it is already being utilized in support of another project in the eastern region of the country (TE, 29, 67). In addition, project activities have influenced the creation of two entrepreneurial initiatives: a women's group producing vegetables commercially, and a facility producing organic agricultural supplies with the aim of sustainably improving soil fertility (TE, 47).

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE identifies seven key lessons learned (TE, 74):

1. Use of micro-watershed as a territorial unit to organize work requires a significant level of communication with the communities to instill the notion of interdependence between them and their immediate environment.
2. Participatory processes such as (list the processes), make it possible for the communities to get involved and participate in a more decisive and conscious way.
3. Having specialists with abilities and skills in multiple disciplines, with a vocation for service and willing to put into practice what they teach, motivates participants and increases their commitment to the activities.
4. Establishing durable institutional arrangements that are resilient to changes in administration, speeds up implementation.
5. Mobilizing commitments of the different institutions for post-project follow up activities increases their influence over time and improves the prospects for sustainability of the achievements.
6. Having a proactive executing unit, including the technical team, that promotes efficient planning, implementation and communication, makes it possible to coordinate actions and generate synergies in a context of fluid inter-institutional work.
7. Dedicating resources to strengthen the administrative and financial capacity of the implementing unit facilitates efficient management not only for the preparation of reports in a timely manner, but also to streamline procurement processes, avoiding delays that put the achievement of the outcomes at risk.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides two recommendations, both directed at FAO (TE, 78):

1. Continue with the type of systematic and participatory processes used in the design of the project but improve them in the following aspects:
 - a. Gender and young people: Prepare a strategy that takes a gender-sensitive approach and takes young people into account, with clear methodologies, actions and monitoring.
 - b. Management of expectations: Ensure effective communication with all stakeholders to ensure that their interest is maintained, while making it clear that a long time passes between the period of consultation, design and approval and the date for the potential start of implementation.

- c. Synergies: Perform a detailed analysis of the partner institutions to identify resources and capacities installed that can complement/reinforce the technical work achieved during the project.
 - d. Efficiency: Incorporate appropriate resources into the budget (based on a diagnosis of capacities) to guarantee efficient administrative management.
 - e. Monitoring: Include the necessary resources and time to design and implement a monitoring plan based on quality indicators that provides relevant and useful information, and complement it if required with systems available in the country.
 - f. Sustainability: Request the preparation of a sustainability plan in a timely fashion which must be the responsibility of the highest body in charge of a project.
2. Call upon the Project Steering Committee and the highest municipal authorities to prepare a monitoring and joint support plan (given the lack of a sustainability strategy) to consolidate the progress made. FAO must make the most of new initiatives in the area to incorporate activities that reinforce the outcomes achieved.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report assesses all the achievement of all project outcomes, including all targets in the logframe, individually and in great detail.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and mostly complete, except that the rating for executing agency's performance is not explained.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report adequately assesses sustainability across the four dimensions.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs and co-financing, but it is not disaggregated by activity.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report evaluates M&E systems, but does not justify its rating for M&E implementation or discuss it in adequate detail.	MU
Overall TE Rating		S

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

No additional sources were used in the preparation of this TER.